

Abstract

The master thesis on the topic *Why do states decide for or against the intervention in other states? Case Study: Libya and Syria* is focused on analysing the motives of states, which are crucial for deciding to intervene or not to intervene in the territory of a foreign state. The whole issue is assessed from the perspective of two major theories of international relations – liberalism and realism. As the first research case was chosen the international community's intervention in Libya in 2011. The case was analysed from the perspective of Sweden, which took part in the operation by the deployment of eight fighters Jas 39 Gripen. As the second case was chosen the civil war in Syria, which has been underway since 2011 and whose situation would have required similar interference by the international community. However, this has not happen until that time, although the states are militarily involved in Syria. This case was analysed from the view of Russia, which did not take part in operation in Libya, but since September 2015 has been involved in fighting on the ground in Syria. As a last case was chosen Great Britain, which has militarily participated in both conflicts. For the analysis itself was used Ortega's typology of interventions, which was adapted for the purpose of this work. The different types of interventions were divided into two categories: liberal interventions and realistic interventions. The first group includes humanitarian intervention, ideological intervention, collective intervention and Responsibility to Protect (R2P), the second group includes balance of power and imperialist intervention. As the final table shows, we can identify three main group of interventures: liberal in Libya, realistic in Syria and mixed in both cases.